

THE REGULATORY EFFICIENCY
ACT**HON. RANDY TATE**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1995

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to streamline our Nation's regulatory process. The Regulatory Efficiency Act of 1995 will force Government agencies to finalize proposed regulations within 18 months or the proposals will be terminated.

For too long, Government bureaucrats have terrorized private property owners, small businesses, and individuals with unreasonable regulatory proposals. Too many Americans and their businesses have worried about complying with costly and burdensome proposed regulations well before they take effect. In many cases, a proposed regulation will loom while taxpayers are waiting for the ax to fall. Many time, businesses spend thousands of dollars to change their facilities or operations because they expect that they will have to comply with the proposed regulation in the future. Unfortunately, our regulatory system is far from perfect. Too often is the case when businesses comply with a proposed regulation, only to have the proposed regulation change significantly, or be withdrawn, before it becomes final. Many in fact, change the way they operate soon after a regulation is proposed only to clear later that the proposed regulation is not the regulation that will become effective. In other cases, proposed regulations do not become final until weeks before their enforceability—leaving it impossible for businesses to comply in a timely fashion. I do not need to tell my colleagues what happens when a business does not comply with a Federal regulation.

We must put an end to this drawn-out regulatory roller coaster ride. American taxpayers and businesses should know there is a definite date by which a proposed regulation becomes final or it will terminate. The American people want common sense returned to Government. My bill brings efficiency and certainly back to the regulatory process. I urge my colleagues to support this long-awaited legislation.

MIDTOWN COMMUNITY SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before the House of Representatives to take this opportunity to congratulate Midtown Community School of Bayonne, NJ. Midtown Community School was recently selected by Redbook as one of the best schools in America.

Midtown Community School is an example of what is right about public school education. We are constantly bombarded in the media by horror stories about how public education is letting our children down. Nothing could be further from the truth at MCS. At MCS they take extra effort to expose the students to advanced technology. Technology is the cornerstone of the curriculum at MCS and it is incor-

porated into every aspect of the school day, from the science classes to the music classes. The students teachers and administrators don't just talk about the electronic super highway, they are riding it.

Nearly 500 schools were nominated for the prestigious award by State and national leaders, but only 142 schools were recognized by Redbook. A panel of 10 distinguished educational experts selected the winners. It took dedication by the parents and staffs to work collectively to earn this recognition.

Midtown Community School is one of the best elementary schools in the country. It is an example of what public education can accomplish and we take great pride in knowing that it is part of our community. MCS's commitment to education does not end at 3 p.m. It offers a wide range of educational programs to all segments of the community. MCS fosters lifelong learning. Schools like MCS nurture students. They create a climate in which they can excel. At the same time they insure that our country will be competitive in the next century. MCS is a national educational treasure and deserves emulation. There can be no doubt that at Midtown Community School the future is here, today.

Please join me in honoring this excellent educational institution for their extraordinary accomplishment. Lets not forget that the future of our Nation depends on the students of today. I am proud to have a school in the 13th Congressional District which serves as an academic role model for the rest of the Nation. That school is the Midtown Community School of Bayonne.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE
COALITION BUDGET**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of tough, economic choices. Congress is faced with a \$4.7 trillion debt that is depriving our Nation of the investments we need to improve our economic productivity and give our children a stable future.

I have long searched for a solution to the problems facing my constituents and the country as a whole. I have listened to the concerns of the hard-working people in my district. They understand that sacrifices have to be made in order to get our financial debt under control. They just want to make sure that it is done in a fair, sensible, common-sense way.

This is why I voted for a budget proposal that is tough on the deficit, but makes only the cuts necessary to balance the budget.

Unfortunately, the Republicans in the House have proposed a budget that puts off consideration of cuts until after \$350 billion in tax cuts are put in place. I want to see those tax cuts become a reality—but we need to reduce government first. The Senate has put forth a budget that reflects this idea. They agree that it is not good fiscal policy to start giving out tax credits before the budget is balanced.

The budget resolution that I support makes many tough choices. It is a new, bold solution to really fix what needs fixing—reigning in government spending. But it does it much more slowly and deliberately than what the Repub-

licans have proposed. It will cut what needs to be cut, but it doesn't go too far, too fast. The budget proposal I voted for makes conservative, but not unreasonable cuts, in funding for programs such as education, health, economic development, and maintains the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund.

The Republican budget proposal would cause Cook County to lose \$90 million in mass transit funds, \$6.8 billion in Medicare funding, and \$1.5 million in community development grants. I am for balancing the budget. I just do not want to make drastic and unnecessary cuts that will hurt my community, especially its elderly.

The Coalition Budget Substitute that I supported makes smart choices about downsizing the government:

It slows the growth of Medicare just enough to keep the Trust Fund solvent. What we need to do in the next several years is lower the projected cost of the Medicare Program, while preserving benefits, quality, choice and affordability. We can do this by aggressively investigating fraud and abuse, and offer incentives to encourage the use of fewer and less expensive services. Medicare growth needs to be controlled, but drastically increasing the premiums of Medicare recipients is not the answer.

It turns Medicaid into a block grant and slows the current growth rate of the program. The Coalition Substitute cuts less than the Republican bill—\$50 billion less in cuts—but it will significantly reorder Medicaid funding. This program is important to Illinois because 50 percent of the beneficiaries are disabled individuals who are unable to work, and 20 percent are elderly who need assistance with nursing home care costs. The Republican budget's cuts would be so severe, that long-term care for the more vulnerable elderly and disabled would be non-existent. Medicaid needs changing, and the Coalition Budget Substitute can accomplish this change without devastating the elderly and disabled in Illinois.

Many health care organizations have come out in support of the Coalition Budget Substitute because they know that our health care system cannot continue to meet the needs of the American people if the broader economy is ill. They support this alternative to the Republican budget proposal because it makes hard choices while still preserving essential safety net programs in Medicare and Medicaid.

It incorporates savings from welfare reform that will not give benefits to non-citizens. It is time for this country to put the needs of its hard-working, law-abiding citizens ahead of those who do not contribute to our economy. This bill does gives priority to legal U.S. citizens.

It does not cut guaranteed student loans. The Republican budget proposal would start penalizing children while they were still in school. We need to continue educating our children, not take away their ability to improve themselves and our country.

It deletes the tax on Federal employees, so people who have contributed all their lives to their pension will not be penalized for doing so. The Republicans included this increase in Federal employees' contributions to pay for tax cuts, but I don't agree with targeting one group of retirees for this purpose. It is not fair, and the budget proposal I voted for would right this wrong.

It cuts \$11 billion less than the Republicans' bill for child health and immunization, medical research, and other essential health programs. It is important that we recognize that medical research and immunization is crucial to ward off and cure devastating diseases.

It makes some cuts, but \$6 billion less than the Republicans' bill, in economic development programs, such as job training and Community Development Block Grants [CDBGs].

It saves \$4.1 billion from farm programs over 7 years.

If partisan feelings were put aside, I believe that Republicans and Democrats could have come together on this common-sense plan to cut government spending and reduce the deficit. Unfortunately, the cuts proposed by the Coalition budget resolution did not pass the House.

I suspect that a similar proposal to the one that was voted down today will arise from the conference between the Senate and the House. Many members of the Senate would rather focus on deficit reduction than tax cuts. That just makes sense. Even though this bill was voted down today, this is just the beginning of the process. We still have a chance to fulfill our commitment to our children by reducing the deficit, but continue to keep our contract to our parents.

H.R. 961: WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE, BUT NOT A DROP TO DRINK

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the House of Representatives approved H.R. 961, a revision of the Clean Water Act that will for the first time in decades help make the Nation's water dirtier rather than cleaner. I strongly and emphatically opposed this legislation. Sometimes you show what you stand for by what you vote against. This is one of those times.

The provisions of H.R. 961 seem to indicate that the new majority has a case of special interest amnesia. Just because a few corporate polluters claim they're overregulated. So the majority willingly forgets the days when our rivers burned, when fish and wildlife floated dead in out lakes and streams, and when our drinking water was in imminent danger of contamination.

More than 20 years ago, the Clean Water Act began to remedy that situation. But this week, the new majority voted to gut that landmark law.

Mr. Speaker, the implications of this legislation are especially grim for New York City. Thanks to the original Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, New York City's water supply needs no additional purification, a remarkable accomplishment for the largest city in the Nation. But the weakened standards in H.R. 961 on pollution runoff will severely jeopardize the drinking water of the more than 8 million people who live in New York City. The cost to New Yorkers to create a water purification system that we have never needed is estimated at more than \$10 billion.

Second, just as New York City is about to achieve, at great expense, secondary treat-

ment at all of its sewage treatment plants—including the large Newtown Creek Water Pollution Control Plant located in my district—H.R. 961 relaxes the basic Clean Water Act permitting system to allow more toxic discharges of industrial and sewage waste into New York Harbor. This will not only roll back years of success in making New York Harbor cleaner and safer, but will also negatively impact bodies of water near cities all over the Nation.

Third, dredging and disposal of toxic contaminated sediments will be expanded, with far less consideration of health and environmental impacts. This will make it harder to protect the thousands of people who swim and fish in New York Harbor from the negative impacts of ongoing dredging projects in New York Harbor.

When is the new majority going to realize that some Government regulations actually do some good? Will we have to wait until we all have to drink from and bathe in bottled water before that realization occurs? I hope not.

But this week, the new majority isn't just throwing out the baby with the bathwater. They're throwing out the drinking water, too.

I hope that as this bill goes to the Senate and to the conference committee, that my colleagues will think about what we drink. I hope that we will not lose this chance to pass a bill that truly deserves the title, "Clean Water Act."

RESOLVE THE POW/MIA ISSUE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing House Joint Resolution 89, a resolution that conveys bipartisan support for the President's stated commitment to resolve the POW/MIA issue. It states that we believe the President should certify to the Congress that the criteria he imposed in July 1993 as preconditions to further movement have been met before the United States takes further economic and political steps to improve relations with Vietnam. It reinforces the need for Vietnam to cooperate fully to resolve this issue which, to date, Vietnam has not done despite repeated pledges, even in 1994.

The President has already more than amply rewarded the Vietnamese for assisting with joint field activities. In 1993, he removed United States opposition to Vietnam's access to international funds through the IMF and World Bank and waiving restrictions to allow United States firms to bid for contracts. In 1994, the President lifted the trade embargo, and a U.S. liaison office was established in Hanoi this year. What has been the result? Very meager—only 38 Americans accounted for by the Clinton administration.

In short, the administration's policy of paying incentives is not working; priority U.S. objectives are not being met. Other than to expand opportunities for the Government of Vietnam, what is the basis for rushing to normalize relations with Vietnam? Before Congress should support any further steps to meet Hanoi's agenda, Vietnam must honor pledges made to the National League of Families, March 1994, and the Presidential delegation, July 1994, to renew and increase their unilateral efforts to account for missing Americans.

The resolution is fair; it is reasonable, and should be the least that the Congress expects of the Commander in Chief. We are simply asking the President to certify to Congress that Vietnam is working seriously to account for missing Americans before moving forward to accommodate Vietnam's interests.

We are asking that the President be certain in his own mind that the Vietnamese leaders are cooperating fully, no longer manipulating answers for the families and veterans who have waited so long. Despite serious concerns many have had about Vietnam's lack of good faith on the POW/MIA issue, the President has seen fit to move forward in significant ways with Vietnam. At the same time, the President has stated that he was taking such steps in appreciation for Vietnam's cooperation and to encourage them to greater efforts.

The problem is that the approach is not working; Vietnam is not providing information and remains that should be the easiest to locate and provide. I'm referring to remains of Americans depicted in photographs, announced as shot down and killed—these should be the most readily available. Yet, 20 years since the fall of Saigon, and in some cases 30 years since these Americans were lost, Hanoi still has not provided the accounting that U.S. intelligence expects should be made. Yes, they are supporting field activities, cooperation for which they are well paid, but they are not accounting for Americans last known alive, in captivity or on the ground alive, in close proximity to Vietnamese forces, one must as "Why?"

The answer is that Vietnam is achieving its objectives without meeting the criteria outlined by President Clinton in July 1993. The resolution simply expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should adhere to his own policy and move no further with Vietnam, economically or politically, until Vietnamese leaders make the decision to really cooperate.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 89, and I ask that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.J. RES. 89

Prohibiting funds for diplomatic relations and further advancement of economic relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) unless the President certifies to Congress that Vietnamese officials are being fully cooperative and forthcoming with efforts to account for the 2,205 Americans still missing and otherwise unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, as determined on the basis of all information available to the United States Government, and for other purposes.

Whereas significant economic and political steps have already been taken by the United States, including the lifting of the United States trade embargo and the establishment of liaison offices, to express appreciation to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam for its past assistance on the POW/MIA issue and to urge increased cooperation;

Whereas, although the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has continued to provide support for joint POW/MIA related field activities with the United States Pacific Command, there remain several last known alive discrepancy cases, photo cases, and special remains cases which are not likely to be resolved through such field activities, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has not fulfilled its July, 1994, pledge to the President's delegation to Hanoi to renew and increase unilateral efforts to account for these missing Americans;